



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/005,026	12/04/2001	Chee Hung Ben Choi	16675/94636-00	9518

33222 7590 08/10/2005

JONES, WALKER, WAECHTER, POITEVENT, CARRERE
& DENEGRE, L.L.P.
5TH FLOOR, FOUR UNITED PLAZA
8555 UNITED PLAZA BOULEVARD
BATON ROUGE, LA 70809

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, LE V

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/005,026

Applicant(s)

CHOI, CHEE HUNG BEN

Examiner

Le Nguyen

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 May 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 and 35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 and 35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to an amendment filed 5/16/05.
2. Claims 1-35 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 17, 18 and 35 are independent claims. Claims 1-4, 8, 14-21, 25 and 31-33 have been amended; claim 34 has been cancelled; and claim ³⁵~~34~~ has been added. This action is made Final. KK
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 1-33 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Screen Dumps of Netscape 4.75 ("Netscape") in view of Salas et al. ("Salas").

As per claim 1, Netscape teaches a method for creating an individualized listing of links comprising prearranging computer files to form a default directory (fig. 2, *default directory 210*) and retrieving user customization data and reconfiguring a copy of the default directory based on said user customization data, thereby creating an individualized user directory (figs. 3-4; *using customization data retrieved via menus 310 and 410, the default directory is reconfigured to form an individualized directory*). Netscape does not explicitly disclose automatically reconfiguring a copy of a global directory based on a user customization data file. Salas teaches automatically reconfiguring a copy of a global directory based on a user customization data file (col. 4, line 56 through col. 5, line 4; col. 5, lines 11-19; col. 12, lines 31-61). Therefore, it would

have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Salas' teaching of automatically reconfiguring a copy of a global directory based on a user customization data file to Netscape's teaching of reconfiguring a copy of the default directory based on said user customization data in order to allow files and other data to be distributed among multiple users without losing control of usage of the data.

As per claim 2, the modified Netscape teaches a method for creating an individualized listing of links wherein the default directory includes files in the Internet and/or an Intranet (Netscape: fig. 2, *element 210*).

As per claim 3, the modified Netscape teaches a method for creating an individualized listing of links comprising adding files into or removing files from said global default directory (Netscape: fig. 3, *element 320*).

As per claim 4, the modified Netscape teaches a method for creating an individualized directory of computer files comprising allowing multiple client computers to access the global default directory on a server computer ().

As per claim 6, the modified Netscape teaches a method for creating an individualized listing of links comprising providing a user interface for a user to modify files in said user directory (Netscape: figs. 2-4).

As per claim 7, the modified Netscape teaches a method for creating an individualized listing of links wherein said modification of files in said user directory is at least one of opening, cutting, copying, pasting, deleting, or renaming (Netscape: fig. 4, *elements 420 and 430*).

As per claim 8, the modified Netscape teaches a method for creating an individualized listing of links comprising updating said user customization data based on the arrangements or modifications by a user (Netscape: fig. 5).

As per claim 9, the modified Netscape teaches a method for creating an individualized listing of links comprising collecting user customization data from multiple users in order to form a global usage history (Salas: col. 4, line 56 through col. 5, line 4; col. 5, lines 11-19).

As per claim 10, the modified Netscape teaches a method for creating an individualized listing of links comprising sending each user request of a file or folder modification from a client computer to a server computer (Salas: col. 12, lines 31-61).

As per claim 11, the modified Netscape teaches a method for creating an individualized listing of links comprising updating said global usage history based on subsequent user requests to modify or arrange files or folders (Salas: col. 4, line 56 through col. 5, line 4; col. 5, lines 11-19; col. 12, lines 31-61).

As per claim 12, the modified Netscape teaches a method for creating an individualized listing of links comprising recording a particular directory modification specified by a user request and the number of requests specifying a particular modification (Salas: col. 14, lines 25-55).

As per claim 13, the modified Netscape teaches a method for creating an individualized listing of links comprising storing said global usage history in a database (Salas: fig. 1; *database 20 and 20' with respective portions of the specification*).

As per claim 14, the modified Netscape teaches a method for creating an individualized listing of links comprising updating said global default directory based on the global usage history (Salas: col. 4, line 56 through col. 5, line 4; col. 5, lines 11-19; col. 12, lines 31-61).

As per claim 15, the modified Netscape teaches a method for creating an individualized listing of links comprising adding, removing, or renaming files or folders in the global default directory based on said global usage history (Netscape: figs 2-4; Salas: col. 4, line 56 through col. 5, line 4; col. 5, lines 11-19).

As per claim 16, the modified Netscape teaches a method for creating an individualized listing of links comprising modifying attributes of files or folders in the global default directory based on said global usage history (Salas: col. 4, line 56 through col. 5, line 4; col. 5, lines 11-19).

Claim 17 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 8 and 11 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 18 is similar in scope to claim 1 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 19 is similar in scope to claim 2 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 20 is similar in scope to claim 3 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 21 is similar in scope to claim 4 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 22 is similar in scope to claim 5 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 23 is similar in scope to claim 6 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 24 is similar in scope to claim 7 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 25 is similar in scope to claim 8 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 26 is similar in scope to claim 9 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 27 is similar in scope to claim 10 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 28 is similar in scope to claim 11 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 29 is similar in scope to claim 12 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 30 is similar in scope to claim 13 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 31 is similar in scope to claim 14 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 32 is similar in scope to claim 15 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 33 is similar in scope to claim 16 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 35 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 8 and 9 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale except for the feature of automatically retrieving the user customization data, which the modified Netscape also teaches (Salas: col. 11, lines 25-30; col. 16, lines 21-43).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 4, 9, 17, 18, 21, 26 and 34 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2174

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Inquires

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Lê Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4068. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00 am to 3:30 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640.

The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 872-9306 [Official Communication]

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

LVN
Patent Examiner
August 4, 2005

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100